

**REMARKS**

Claims 24-28 and 31-32 have been amended as indicated above. Claims 1-23, 29-30 and 33-86 are cancelled. New claims 87-100 have been added. The Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance. No new matter has been introduced through the amendments to the claims. The Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue any of the cancelled claims by way of one or more continuation applications.

## **Telephonic Communications**

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on November 1 and 2, 2006 discussing the disposition of this case with Applicant's representative via telephone. During those discussions, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the cited art and proposed amendments to independent claim 24 as well as other claim amendments that would receive favorable treatment by the Examiner. While Applicant believes that such modifications are unnecessary, in the spirit of advancing prosecution of this matter, Applicant has made the clarifying amendments listed above and discussed below.

## § 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 24, 46, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office asserts that the language “wherein the information was generated different from the present user context” is not described in the Specification in such way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention (Page 3 of Office action).

1       The Applicant's representative spoke briefly with the Examiner by  
2 telephone in this regard on November 2, 2006. During that conversation, the  
3 Examiner agreed to consider the amended claims provided herein and to offer  
4 suggestions and/or Examiner's amendments to overcome the rejection. Therefore,  
5 the Applicant does not further address the § 112 rejections herein in anticipation of  
6 the Examiner's input.

7

8                   **§ 103 Rejections**

9       Claims 1-2, 5, 24-25, 28, 46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §  
10 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,940 ("Liddy"), in view of  
11 U.S. Patent No. 6,832,218 ("Emens").

12       Claims 3, 26 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
13 unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens, in further view of U.S. Patent No.  
14 5,999,942 ("Talati").

15       Claims 4, 27 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
16 unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens, in further view of U.S. Patent No.  
17 6,895,552 ("Balabanovic").

18       Claims 6-7, 29-30 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
19 unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens, in further view of U.S. Patent No.  
20 6,480,843 ("Li").

21       Claims 8, 31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
22 unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens, in further view of U.S. Patent No.  
23 5,682,539 ("Conrad").

24       Claims 9, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
25 unpatentable over Liddy in view of Emens, in further view of U.S. Patent No.

1 6,366,908 ("Chong").

2 Claims 1-2, 5, 24-25, 28, 46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §  
3 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,873,076 ("Barr"), in view of  
4 Liddy and Emens. Applicant believes in good faith that this rejection was cited  
5 under § 102(b) in error and that rejection under § 103(a) was the true intent of the  
6 Examiner (page 14 of Office action).

7 Claims 3, 26 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
8 unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens, in further view of Talati.

9 Claims 4, 27 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
10 unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens, in further view of  
11 Balabanovic.

12 Claims 6-7, 29-30 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
13 unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens, in further view of Li.

14 Claims 8, 31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
15 unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens, in further view of Conrad.

16 Claims 9, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
17 unpatentable over Barr in view of Liddy and Emens, in further view of Chong.

18

19 **Further Remarks**

20 Claims 1-9, 29-30 and 46-54 have been cancelled as of this Response.  
21 Therefore, the respective § 112 and § 103 rejections of claims 1-9, 29-30 and 46-  
22 54 are believed moot. Furthermore, the Applicant believes that the § 103 rejection  
23 of claims 24-28 and 31-32 are moot in view of the respective amendments  
24 provided above.

1       New claims 87-100 have been added as provided above. In particular, new  
2 independent claim 87 is directed to a computer-implemented method, while new  
3 independent claim 94 is directed to a system. New independent claims 87 and 94  
4 recite respective subject matter in direct correspondence to that of independent  
5 claim 24, as amended. New claims 88-93 and 95-100 depend from new  
6 independent claims 87 and 94, respectively.

7       In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the  
8 telephonic interviews with the Examiner as cited above, the Applicant believes  
9 that all pending claims 24-32 and 87-100 are allowable and respectfully requests  
10 that the Application be forwarded on to issuance.

11

12       Conclusion

13       The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is  
14 respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the  
15 application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance  
16 of a subsequent Office action.

17

18

Respectfully submitted,

19

20 Date: 11/10/06

By:

Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256

21

22

23

24

25